



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,108	07/22/2003	Robert James Howard	711-007US	9419
49767 7590 04/30/2007 DEMONT & BREYER, LLC 100 COMMONS WAY HOLMDEL, NJ 07733			EXAMINER CALLAHAN, PAUL E	
			ART UNIT 2137	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/30/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/625,108

Applicant(s)

HOWARD ET AL.

Examiner

Paul Callahan

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 24-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-9, 18-20 and 29-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10-17, 21 and 24-28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-21 and 24-38 are pending in the instant application and have been examined.
2. The indicated allowability of claims 18-20 and 32-38 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Low et al., US 3,611,274. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 10-17, 21, and 24-28 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 10 recites the limitation "said first hardware" in line 8. There is no further language that modifies this passage. Claims 11-17 are dependent on claim 10 and are therefore objected to on the same basis as is that claim.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "said first hardware" in line 6. There is no further language that modifies this passage. Claims 24-28 are dependent on claim 21 and are therefore objected to on the same basis as is that claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 7-9, 18-20, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claim 7 recites the limitation "retrieves said first unique identifier..." in line 15. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 8 and 9 are dependent on claim 7 and are thereby rejected on the same basis as is that claim.

7. Claim 18 recites the limitation "retrieves said first unique identifier..." in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 19 and 20 are dependent on claim 18 and are thereby rejected on the same basis as is that claim.

8. Claim 29 recites the limitation "compares said first unique identifier" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 30 and 31 are dependent on claim 29 and are thereby rejected on the same basis as is that claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 32, 37, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Low et al., US 3,611,274.

As for claim 32, Low teaches an apparatus comprising a first adapter and a second adapter (fig. 1, col. 2 lines 39-48), wherein said first adapter couples a first port associated with a computer peripheral to said second adapter, said second adapter couples said first adapter to a second port associated with a processor (col. 1 line 18-28: the connectors are taught as connecting umbilical cables ending in processing circuits in a missile and a launch facility, the use of a port at each terminus is inherent, the missile processor circuits constitute a peripheral to a launch facility processor); said first adapter comprises a first keyed-connector; said second adapter comprises a second keyed-connector; and said second keyed-connector mates with said first keyed-connector (fig. 1, elements 10, 12, 14, 18, col. 2 lines 39-56: the connectors are held by screws 18 which constitutes a keyed connector).

As for claim 37, Low teaches the apparatus of claim 32 wherein said first keyed-connector is chosen from the list consisting of a tamper-proof seal, a screw head, and a physical key (fig. 1, element 18, col. 2 lines 39-56: the connectors are held by screws 18 which constitutes a keyed connector).

As for claim 38, Low teaches the apparatus of claim 32 wherein said first keyed-connector is destroyed when removed from said first port (col. 1 lines 39-48: the connectors are taught as "breakaway" connectors which are destroyed when tension of a threshold value is placed on the umbilical cables).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Low as applied to claim 32, and Munger, Jr. et al., US 6,821,159.

As for claim 33, Low teaches the apparatus of claim 32, but not wherein said first keyed-connector and said second keyed-connector are unique for each peripheral. However, Munger teaches a system wherein a keyed connector may be uniquely configured such that a male and female connector may be connected with only each

Art Unit: 2137

other. Official Notice may be taken that the use of such an arrangement in connecting peripherals to a main processor is old and well known in the art. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate these features into the system of Low. It would have been desirable to do so as such an arrangement would prevent misconnection of a missile to an onboard aircraft processor. Motive to make the combination is found in Low col. 1 lines 13-28 where the importance of properly configuring a missile in a "prelaunch but mated configuration."

As for claim 34, Low teaches the apparatus of claim 32, but not wherein said first keyed-connector and said second keyed-connector are unique for a peripheral type. However, Munger teaches a system wherein a keyed connector may be uniquely configured such that a male and female connector may be connected with only each other. Official Notice may be taken that the use of such an arrangement in connecting peripherals to a main processor is old and well known in the art. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate these features into the system of Low. It would have been desirable to do so as such an arrangement would prevent misconnection of a missile to an onboard aircraft processor. Motive to make the combination is found in Low col. 1 lines 13-28 where the importance of properly configuring a missile in a "prelaunch but mated configuration."

As for claim 35, Low teaches the apparatus of claim 32, but not wherein said first keyed-connector and said second keyed-connector are unique for a computer network associated with said processor. However, Munger teaches a system wherein a keyed connector may be uniquely configured such that a male and female connector may be connected with only each other. Official Notice may be taken that the use of such an arrangement in connecting a processor to a network is old and well known in the art. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate these features into the system of Low. It would have been desirable to do so as such an arrangement would prevent misconnection of a missile to an onboard aircraft processor where the missile is typically remote from a launch facility. Motive to make this combination is found in Low, col. 1 lines 13-28, where the importance of properly configuring the connection between a missile and a launch facility are discussed.

As for claim 36 Low teaches the apparatus of claim 32, but not wherein said first keyed-connector and said second keyed-connector are unique for a product type. Munger teaches a system wherein a keyed connector may be uniquely configured such that a male and female connector may be connected with only each other. Official Notice may be taken that the use of such an arrangement in connecting a processor to a particular product type is old and well known in the art. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate these features into the system of Low. It would have been desirable to do so



as such an arrangement would, for example, prevent the use of an umbilical cable not designed to operate properly with a missile. Motive to make this combination is found in Low, col. 1 lines 13-28, where the importance of properly configuring the connection between a missile and a launch facility are discussed.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

13. Claims 1-6 are allowed.

***Conclusion***

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2137

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "P. L. Moore".

PEC  
4-27-07

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Emmanuel L. Moise".

EMMANUEL L. MOISE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER